

REMARKS

The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claims 24-34 and 71-103 in view of the following arguments.

CLAIM STATUS

Claims 1-23, and 35-70 have been canceled.

Claims 93 - 103 have been added.

Claims 24-34 and 71-103 are pending.

Claims 36-46 have been canceled because they include identical language to pending claims 24-34 except for the additional word "first" regarding the winning progressive jackpot.

Claims 47-57 were canceled and rewritten as newly added pending claims 93-103 which correspond to the previously allowed but now canceled claims 47-57.

Claims 59-69 have been canceled because they were duplicate claims that recited identical language to that of pending claims 71-81.

Claims 82-92 remain unamended except for an antecedent basis error noticed preparing this response.

Pending claims 24-34 and 71-81 recite paying either a first or a second progressive jackpot based on a wager amount, while independent claims 82 and 93 recite paying the largest of either the first or the second progressive jackpot when the result is a winning jackpot.

1 CLAIM REJECTIONS

2 In an effort to avoid confusion, regardless of the canceled and newly added claims, the
3 claim rejections are recited with claim numbering as it appears in the original Office Action. The
4 Examiner rejected claims 24-34, 36-46, 48-57, 59-69, and 71-92 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as
5 being anticipated by Wood (U.S. patent No. 5,286,023) and Keesee (U.S. patent No. 5,282,620).
6 The Examiner also rejected claims 24-34, 36-46, 48-57, 59-69, and 71-92 under 35 U.S.C. §
7 102(e) as being anticipated by Jones (U.S. patent No. 6,402,150) and Grippo et al. (U.S. patent
8 No. 6,017,032, hereinafter referred to as "Grippo"). The Applicants respectfully submit that the
9 claims are not anticipated by any of these references.

10
11 Wood and Keesee

12 Wood and Keesee disclose a video lottery game that includes both a first and a second
13 progressive jackpot prize. "The first progressive jackpot prize amount is substantially greater
14 than the second progressive jackpot prize amount" (Wood, col. 4, lines 31-56) and "a player
15 winning one of said first or second progressive jackpot prize amounts does not affect the amount
16 of the other of said first or second progressive jackpot prize amounts" (Wood, col.4, lines 28-30).
17 The choice of progressive prize jackpot for payout is randomly determined (see Wood, col. 6,
18 lines 30-37).

19 Jones

20 Jones discloses a casino card game having a jackpot component as an additional feature
21 of the card game. A progressive jackpot is included that is awarded according to a hand of cards
22 in the card game (see Jones, col. 6, lines 20-40).

1 Grippo

2 Grippo discloses a lottery game that allows bettors to select the amount of the desired
3 wager to enter the lottery game. "Each of the wager denominational levels corresponds to a
4 separate wager or jackpot pool" (Grippo, col. 5, lines 63-67). Thus, the bettor selects the bettor
5 pool they will enter prior to placing a bet in the lottery game. The jackpot pool is a progressive
6 jackpot pool which increases in value with the bets of the bettor pool for the jackpot pool until a
7 winning ticket is found for the specific bettor pool and the progressive jackpot pool is awarded.

8
9 Applicants' claims are NOT anticipated by the cited references

10 Regarding independent claim 24, previously depending on canceled independent claim
11 23, Wood and Keesee each fail to teach, disclose or otherwise suggest paying progressive
12 jackpots according to a wager amount for a winning progressive jackpot result. Further, Wood
13 and Keesee each fail to show or suggest increasing a second progressive jackpot more than a first
14 progressive jackpot in response to receiving a wager. Likewise, Jones and Grippo each fail to
15 show or suggest increasing a second progressive jackpot more than a first progressive jackpot in
16 response to receiving a wager.

17 Regarding dependent claim 25, for at least the reason as this claim adds limitations to an
18 otherwise allowable independent claim 24, the rejection to claim 25 should be withdrawn and
19 Applicants respectfully solicit a Notice of Allowance for claim 25.

20 Regarding independent claim 26, Wood and Keesee each fail to teach, disclose or
21 otherwise suggest paying progressive jackpots according to a wager amount for a winning
22 progressive jackpot result. Further, Wood and Keesee each fail to show or suggest paying

1 multiple progressive jackpots if the wager is at least a predetermined amount. Likewise, Jones
2 and Grippo each fail to show or suggest paying multiple progressive jackpots if the wager is at
3 least a predetermined amount.

4 Regarding independent claim 27, Wood and Keesee each fail to teach, disclose or
5 otherwise suggest paying progressive jackpots according to a wager amount for a winning
6 progressive jackpot result. Further, Wood and Keesee each fail to show or suggest resetting the
7 first progressive jackpot to a first predetermined reset amount after paying the first progressive
8 jackpot, and resetting the second progressive jackpot to a second predetermined reset amount
9 after paying the second progressive jackpot. Likewise, Jones and Grippo each fail to show or
10 suggest resetting the first progressive jackpot to a first predetermined reset amount after paying
11 the first progressive jackpot, and resetting the second progressive jackpot to a second
12 predetermined reset amount after paying the second progressive jackpot.

13 Regarding dependent claim 28, for at least the reason as this claim adds limitations to an
14 otherwise allowable independent claim 27, the rejection to claim 28 should be withdrawn and
15 Applicants respectfully solicit a Notice of Allowance for claim 28.

16 Regarding independent claim 29, Wood and Keesee each fail to teach, disclose or
17 otherwise suggest paying progressive jackpots according to a wager amount for a winning
18 progressive jackpot result. Further, Wood and Keesee each fail to show or suggest the gaming
19 system comprising a single gaming machine. Likewise, Jones and Grippo each fail to show or
20 suggest the gaming system comprising a single gaming machine.

21 Regarding independent claim 30, Wood and Keesee each fail to teach, disclose or
22 otherwise suggest paying progressive jackpots according to a wager amount for a winning

1 progressive jackpot result. Further, Wood and Keesee each fail to show or suggest the
2 progressive jackpots being common to all linked gaming machines of a gaming system and
3 increasing the progressive jackpots in response to a wager received by a linked gaming machine.
4 Likewise, Jones and Grippo each fail to show or suggest the progressive jackpots being common
5 to all linked gaming machines of a gaming system and increasing the progressive jackpots in
6 response to a wager received by a linked gaming machine.

7 Regarding independent claim 31, Wood and Keesee each fail to teach, disclose or
8 otherwise suggest paying progressive jackpots according to a wager amount for a winning
9 progressive jackpot result. Further, Wood and Keesee each fail to show or suggest the wager
10 activating a single play line for a gaming machine receiving the wager. Likewise, Jones and
11 Grippo each fail to show or suggest the wager activating a single play line for a gaming machine
12 receiving the wager.

13 Regarding independent claim 32, Wood and Keesee each fail to teach, disclose or
14 otherwise suggest paying progressive jackpots according to a wager amount for a winning
15 progressive jackpot result. Further, Wood and Keesee each fail to show or suggest the wager
16 activating a plurality of play lines for a gaming machine receiving the wager. Likewise, Jones
17 and Grippo each fail to show or suggest the wager activating a plurality of play lines for a gaming
18 machine receiving the wager.

19 Regarding independent claim 33, Wood and Keesee each fail to teach, disclose or
20 otherwise suggest paying progressive jackpots according to a wager amount for a winning
21 progressive jackpot result. Further, Wood and Keesee each fail to show or suggest a number of
22 play lines activated by a second wager amount being identical to a number of play lines activated

1 by a first wager amount. Likewise, Jones and Grippo each fail to show or suggest a number of
2 play lines activated by a second wager amount being identical to a number of play lines activated
3 by a first wager amount.

4 Regarding independent claim 34, Wood and Keesee each fail to teach, disclose or
5 otherwise suggest paying progressive jackpots according to a wager amount for a winning
6 progressive jackpot result. Further, Wood and Keesee each fail to show or suggest a number of
7 play lines activated by the second wager amount being larger than a number of play lines
8 activated by the first wager amount. Likewise, Jones and Grippo each fail to show or suggest a
9 number of play lines activated by the second wager amount being larger than a number of play
10 lines activated by the first wager amount.

11 As claims 35 through 70 have been canceled, the rejections to these claims are moot and
12 should be withdrawn.

13 Regarding claims 71 through 81, the above arguments regarding the method of claims 24
14 through 34 apply to the system of claims 71 through 81 and the Applicants urge the Examiner to
15 withdraw the rejections to these claims for similar reasons as to the reasons for withdrawing the
16 rejections to claims 24 through 34.

17 Regarding original independent claim 82, the cited references fail to teach or suggest a
18 gaming system that specifically pays the largest of either a first progressive jackpot or a second
19 progressive jackpot if a random gaming result is a winning progressive jackpot result. The cited
20 references, on the other hand, teach randomly selecting one of the progressive jackpots for the
21 amount to be paid for a winning jackpot result. For this reason, Applicants respectfully request
22 the Examiner to withdraw the rejections to independent claim 82. Further, as dependent claims

1 83 through 92 add limitations to an already allowable base claim, Applicants urge the Examiner
2 to withdraw the rejections to these claims as well.

3 Regarding newly added claims 93 through 103, Applicants respectfully submit that these
4 claims set out a method corresponding to the system of independent claim 82. These claims are
5 identical to the previously allowed claims 47-57 of the parent application. Applicants
6 respectfully solicit a Notice of Allowance regarding independent claim 93 and request that the
7 further limiting dependent claims 94 through 103 be allowed as well.
8

1 CONCLUSION

2 For all of the above reasons, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and
3 allowance of claims 24-34 and 71-103.

4 If any issue remains as to the allowability of these claims, or if a conference might
5 expedite allowance of the claims, the Examiner is asked to telephone the undersigned attorney
6 prior to issuing a further action in this case.

7
8 Respectfully submitted,

9 THE CULBERTSON GROUP, P.C.

10
11 Dated: 13 July 2005

12 By: Russell C. Scott
13 Russell D. Culbertson, Reg. No. 32,124
14 Russell C. Scott, Reg. No. 43,103
15 Trevor Lind, Reg. No. 54,785
16 1114 Lost Creek Boulevard, Suite 420
17 Austin, Texas 78746
18 512-327-8932
19 ATTORNEYS FOR APPLICANTS

20 CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE

21 I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, (Fax
22 No. 703-872-9306) on July 13, 2005.

23 Russell C. Scott, Reg. No. 43,103

24 Russell C. Scott
25
26

1112_Response_Notice of Noncompliance.wpd